



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

portant despatch of July 8, 1842, on the affairs of Texas (*House Ex. Doc. No. 266*, 27 Cong., 2 sess.), the letter of the Texan consul at New York, January 4, 1844 (Jones, *Memoranda*, p. 303), on the prospects for annexation, nor even that from Miller, special secretary of the Texan legation at Washington, April 28, 1844 (*ibid.*, p. 345), on the same subject. Donelson's note to Allen, April 16, 1845, is entered twice (p. 45); and, if one looks up the reference for Terrell to Eve, October 15, 1842 (p. 32), one finds Van Zandt to Webster, December 14, 1842, which is substantially the same thing but might not be recognized as such by the inquirer. Then follows the Correspondence Hitherto Unpublished, which forms the body of the volume and presents countless illustrations of the editor's fidelity and scholarship. With propriety he has omitted some documents of slight significance and occasionally cut out a paragraph of the same character; but it is a question whether certain important documents which, though in print, are beyond easy reach should not have been given. For instance, the investigator is referred (p. 30) for the instructions to the Texan minister at Washington regarding annexation, January 20, 1842, to the (*Houston*) *Telegraph and Texas Register* of November 26, 1845. That newspaper is not to be found even in the Library of Congress, and most American historians could perhaps find this document most easily by going to the Public Record Office in London ("Texas", vol. XIV.). On the other hand, Henderson to Hunt, December 31, 1836, is here given (p. 161) without mention of the fact that it was printed in Texas in 1845. As the editor states, it was not practicable to make the file of correspondence quite complete, and that is of course to be regretted. It would have been well, had it been feasible, to institute a wide search for the missing documents. Collinsworth and Grayson's propositions for the annexation of Texas, addressed to the American government on July 16 [14], 1836, might, for instance, have been found among the Jackson papers. Mis-spelled words are in some cases followed with "[sic]" and in other cases are not, so that in quoting a passage containing one of the latter an author would be a little in doubt how to write it; and one notes that W. D. Jones, American consul at Mexico, appears (p. 213) as M. D. Jones. In a work of such magnitude and difficulty a few slips are of course inevitable.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

Virginia's Attitude toward Slavery and Secession. By BEVERLEY B. MUNFORD. (New York and London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1909. Pp. xiii, 329.)

Mr. MUNFORD has endeavored to show just why Virginia cast her lot with the Lower South in 1861 rather than remain in the Union and escape the awful devastation which surely awaited her if she took up the Southern cause. In part I. he states his case; in part II. he endeavors to prove that Virginia did not secede in order to extend or even

save slavery as an institution; in part III. he shows that the motive was certainly not a wanton desire to destroy the Union; and by process of elimination he comes in part IV. to his thesis, which is that Virginia was forced out by the attitude of President Lincoln and his administration; in short the proclamation of April 15 was the compelling motive.

In the different sections the author draws upon the better known sources of American and Virginia history, quoting freely from the writings of the "Fathers" to prove that the best thought of Virginia was against slavery from the beginning. There could be no difficulty in showing that Washington, Jefferson, and the rest all hated the institution and strove manfully to abolish it. To show also that the second generation of Virginians was equally solicitous to check the ravages of the slave-system might also be possible; but to go on to the eve of the Civil War contending that nobody of influence and power in the Old Dominion favored slavery shows a lack of knowledge of the subject or the field which is a little disparaging to the author's claims. Yet this is just what Mr. Munford attempts to do.

The slave-trade and the status of the free negro are discussed with the result that there was, in the opinion of the author, no breeding of slaves for the Southern market; and the free negro was almost an impossibility both in the South and the North, while to send all the slaves away to Africa was economically almost out of the question. Time wore on and brought the crisis of 1861 and when the national government endeavored to enforce its authority at the point of the bayonet Virginia independently of the whole slavery trouble cast her lot with the party, the Lower South, whose rights were being trampled upon. This is the story. It is calmly and confidently told; but many important facts and conditions are omitted entirely.

First of all, Virginia was a divided camp from 1760, the western counties being hostile to the eastern and hostile likewise to slavery. The constitution of 1776, contrary to the wishes of Jefferson and others, recognized slavery by so distributing power in the legislature as to secure to the East—a minority of the population—permanent control of the lawmaking power of the state. The populous West endeavored in 1829–1830 and again in 1850 to break the hold of the East upon the community. The East, now fully in the hands of a comparatively small group of slaveholding monopolists, withstood all attack and actually strengthened her power with the passing decades. This arrangement was denounced by Jefferson and many others who foresaw the natural consequence to the state but without avail. There is no reference in the volume before us to these conditions and yet they are vital to the story.

Nor does Mr. Munford so much as mention, in his discussion of the charge that Virginia was a slave-breeding state, Governor William B. Giles's published statement (in his book dated 1829) that 6000 slaves were exported from Richmond and Norfolk each year; and he ignores the active and effective propaganda of Thomas R. Dew (after 1832) in defense of the business of raising negroes for the Lower South.

This is not saying that the author is wrong in his contentions, but that he has overlooked some very important matters and failed to explain the attitude of men, who, like H. A. Wise in 1855, promised their hearers that negroes would sell for \$5000 each if Kansas were made a slave state—men who were very popular in Virginia then and whose memories are still green throughout the South. The book is too much of a defense to be final or convincing.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

John Brown. By W. E. BURGHARDT DU BOIS, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, Atlanta University. [American Crisis Biographies.] (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Company. 1909. Pp. 406.)

A NEW and shorter "Life of John Brown" which emphasized the deeds of its hero without dwelling too much upon the great cause has been needed, and this work from an eminent negro educator fills this want to some extent. Hitherto it has been impossible to treat the leader of the raid on Harper's Ferry except as a saint doing God's work or as the vilest of criminals. Victor Hugo compared him to Jesus of Nazareth while Carlyle accounted him only a mischief-maker; Robert E. Lee characteristically passed judgment upon him as "Captain John Brown". Of course Professor Du Bois could not be expected to speak as any of these—a negro judging the most ardent friend of his race. Devotion to the subject of his investigation, hero-worship, perhaps sensationalism, are the terms which most aptly describe the style of this new Life. This may be seen in the chapter headings: the Vision of the Damned, the Swamp of the Swan, the Black Phalanx, the Great Black Way, etc. In addition, each chapter begins with a quotation from the Bible, some of which run: "Remember them that are in bonds as bound with them", "And his fellow answered and said, This is nothing else save the sword of Gideon the son of Joash, a man of Israel."

Aside from this enthusiastic approval, there is much that commends the book. It is an abbreviation of Sanborn's rather tedious work and it presents the facts of Brown's career though in a loose and unconvincing manner. A considerable part of the total space is devoted to the development of the man, his restless roving from place to place, seeking apparently some sudden turn of fortune which should reveal him to the eyes of the world. The Kansas tangle and the bloody work at Osawatomie are treated fairly well. But the main theme is of course Harper's Ferry which is seen simply as the work of God in human hands, as the first battle of the righteous North against the wicked South.

One is surprised, however, to find the author of *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade* stating (p. 84) that the runaway slaves of Georgia founded a state in Florida to overthrow which cost the United States \$20,000,000, or (p. 85) that Toussaint had given Louisiana to